

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. The Examiner has withdrawn Claims 2-5 from consideration. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND Claim 1.

Applicants affirm election of Species D, including Claims 1, 6, and 7. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow Claims 2-5 upon finding that Claim 1 is allowable.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings for allegedly failing to show every feature of Claim 7.

In the third paragraph on the second page of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the feature of “the absorption axis of the first or second polarizer” recited in Claim 7 must be shown in the Drawings or canceled from the claim.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the feature of “the at least one phase plate is arranged such that the c-axis thereof is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the first or second polarizer” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 7 is shown in Fig. 5 of the originally filed application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the Drawings.

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

The Examiner has alleged that the polarizer cannot be arranged such that the c-axis of the polarizer is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the polarizer. In the first sentence on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged, “Therefore, absorption axis of the polarizer cannot be arranged such that the c-axis thereof is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the polarizer” (emphasis in original).

However, Applicants’ Claim 7 does not require that the polarizer be arranged such that the c-axis of the polarizer is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the polarizer. Applicants’ Claim 7 recites, “the at least one phase plate is arranged such that the c-axis thereof is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the first or second

polarizer.” That is, Applicants’ Claim 7 requires that the at least one phase plate, not the polarizer, be arranged such that c-axis of the at least one phase plate is substantially parallel to the absorption axis of the first or second polarizer, as shown, for example, in Applicants’ Fig. 5. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants’ Claim 7 is clear and definite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ditzik (U.S. 5,771,039).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 6.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A liquid crystal display device comprising:
a liquid crystal layer;
a first substrate defining a first plane that is located closer to a viewer than the liquid crystal layer is;
a second substrate arranged so as to face the first substrate with the liquid crystal layer interposed between the first and second substrates;
and
a first polarizer defining a second plane that is located even closer to the viewer than the first substrate is; wherein
the first substrate includes a first plastic substrate in which a plurality of fibers are aligned in a first direction of the first plane,
the first polarizer is aligned such that **the first plane and the second plane are substantially parallel and the transmission axis of the first polarizer is either substantially parallel to, or substantially perpendicular to, the first direction.** (emphasis added)

In Section No. 1 on pages 4 and 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that **Figs. 6A** and **6B** of Ditzik teach each feature recited in Applicants’ Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite the feature of “the first plane [defined by the first substrate] and the second plane [defined by the first polarizer] are substantially parallel.” Applicants’ Claim 1 also recites the feature of “the transmission axis of the first polarizer is either substantially parallel to, or substantially perpendicular to, the first direction.” That is, Applicants’ Claim 1 requires that the first direction and the transmission axis to be aligned in planes that are substantially parallel and requires that

the first direction and the transmission axis be substantially perpendicular.

In the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the optical fibers **8** of faceplate **6** of Ditzik correspond to the plurality of fibers of the first substrate as recited in Applicants' Claim 1 and that the thin front polarizing film **29** of Ditzik correspond to the first polarizer as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. However, as admitted by the Examiner, the optical fibers **8** of Ditzik are aligned in a direction in a vertical plane that is perpendicular and is not parallel to the horizontal plane defined by the front polarizing film **29** of Ditzik.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Ditzik fails to teach or suggest the features of "the first plane [defined by the first substrate] and the second plane [defined by the first polarizer] are substantially parallel" and "the transmission axis of the first polarizer is either substantially parallel to, or substantially perpendicular to, the first direction."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ditzik.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Claims 6 and 7 depend upon Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow Claims 2-5 upon finding that Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to June 28, 2006, the period for response to the Office Action dated February 28, 2006.

Application No. 10/784,617
June 28, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated February 28, 2006
Page 8 of 8

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2006

/Peter Medley #56,125/
Attorneys for Applicants

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125